DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 971 UD 019 730

AUTHOR Cohen, Elizabeth G.
TITLE Status Equalization in the Desegregated School.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; *Black Students; *Caucasian Students; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Status; Experimental Curriculum; Group Structure; *Power Structure; *Race Relations; School Integration; Social Relations; Social Status; *Student Attitudes; *Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Expectation Training; Multiple Abilities Curriculum; *Status Equalization Project

ABSTRACT

The Status Equalization Project had as one of its goals the elimination of systematic white dominance on intellectual tasks in desegregated classrooms. The field experiment described in this report was designed to test the effectiveness of the Multiple Abilities Curriculum and Expectation Training in equalizing race relationships in such settings. Classrooms in three desegregated schools in three communities in the San Francisco Bay area were selected for the experiment. The design of the experiment, the procedures used, and the measurement procedures are described, and results and implications are discussed in detail. Tables provide statistical data on the experiment. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JUL 16 1979

ED175971

STATUS EQUALIZATION IN THE DESEGREGATED SCHOOL*

Elizabeth G. Cohen
Stanford University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E.G. Cohen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD019730

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April, 1979.

(*This research was supported by the National Institute of Education, Grant No. NIE 400-76-0059 at the Center for Educational Research at Stanford)

Not for quotation or citation without the author's permission.

Status Equalization in the Desegregated School

Treating status problems in interracial groups of students who have no previous knowledge of each other is a challenging task; treating status problems in an ongoing desegregated classroom is a different and much harder task. The issue is not one of laboratory versus field research; rather, the difficulty stems from the powerful forces in classroom social structure which affect the behavior one is trying to treat. In order to design interventions, it is necessary to understand the peculiar and intense social relationships in the interracial classroom. Even ordinary classrooms are complicated and not well understood; they exhibit formal and informal social worlds which vary over time and across classrooms and which interact with each other. Add to this the dynamics of interracial relations in schools with almost 50% racial and ethnic minorities and the situation almost defies a systematic analytic approach.

From the start, the Status Equalization Project had clear goals for treatment of desegregated classrooms. One was the elimination of systematic White dominance on intellectual tasks. The students, through interaction in collective tasks, should develop differentiated views of what each person can contribute. Students who are weak performers in conventional academic tasks should acquire expectations for intellectual competence in new and different tasks. If these goals are achieved, racial stereotypes will be greatly weakened. Furthermore, unsuccessful students (often from racial and ethnic minority groups) will no longer exhibit passive, incompetent and sometimes troublesome behaviors; this change in behavior should make progress in the basic skills easier for the teacher and student.

Behind this Project was a long history of theory and research on the core problem of "status generalization." Several treatments designed to produce equal status behavior had been developed with the aid of Expectation States Theory (Berger, J., Cohen, P.B. & Zelditch, M., 1972). These treatments had demonstrated effectiveness in modifying unwanted dominance by high status group members in the laboratory, in an interracial summer school experiment, and in all-White classrooms. With ways to treat problems of academic status and racial status orders and with systematic analysis of the effects of formal instruction on status problems, we felt we were ready to "take on" the desegregated classroom.

The design of this field experiment combined the most successful treatments, contrasting treated and untreated classrooms. The staffing and administration of the interventions was rigorously conceptualized, pre-tested and controlled. The outcome measures were the standardized, behavioral techniques used in previous research. There were vast amounts of auxilliary data collected by observation and questionnaires, before and after the experiment.

Yet no amount of step-by-step procedure could prepare us for what happened. Competing with the carefully formulated and pre-tested interventions was a "natural" treatment. Out of the power relationships between races and out of the constant interpersonal negotiations of the students came a new and different set of power and status arrangements. In many classrooms these forces work to modify the dominance of the students with high academic status.

In sociology of education today it is a truism that classrooms reflect the dominance relations in the outer society. Many of these classrooms, however, did not reflect White dominance at all well; instead they were in some ways a microcosm of Black Power. Socially powerful Black children were seen as able and influential; and all the other Black students were encouraged and stimulated by the standing of their racial group.

But I am getting ahead of the story. Let us start with a brief review of the phenomenon of status generalization and the development of several successful treatments.

Status Generalization

If Black and White junior high school boys, who do not know each other, but who come from the same social class background, are put into four-person groups and given a collective task, the Whites are more likely to be active and influential on the task than the Blacks. This was the finding to emerge from the first study applying Expectation States theory to interracial groups of school children. Since the task was a simple board game requiring no academic skills, there was no rational reason to expect that the Whites would be more active and influential than the Blacks. This is the phenomenon of status generalization. Social psychologists had often demonstrated this effect in mixed status groups, but Expectation Theory provided the first systematic explanation of the process. According to the theory, both White and Black children enter the situation with general expectations of competence and incompetence; these expectations are attached to race in the belief system of American culture. It is generally believed that Blacks are less competent than Whites over a wide variety of tasks. These general expectations do not include a set of specific expectations--stereotypical beliefs such as "Blacks are musical and good at basketball." General expectations are activated in the new situation where the children know nothing about each other but their racial difference. If the nature of the task forces them to evaluate each other's competence, the general expectations become relevant to the specific expectations for competence at the new group task. Thus the Whites who expect to be more competent and are expected to be more competent by the Blacks come to talk more and become more influential. A self-fulfilling prophecy takes

place, whereby White dominance in the society turns into White dominance in the small group setting.

Race is only one example of what the theory calls Diffuse Status Characteristics. Sex and ethnicity are two other examples of diffuse status characteristics with a demonstrated capacity to produce status generalization. (For a recent review of relevant research, see Webster & Driskell, 1978).

Treatments for Competence Expectations

If unwanted White dominance is a product of superior expectations for White competence, then an obvious strategy is to create expectations for competent Black behavior, before the group ever has a chance to interact. This was the idea behind Expectation Training; the Black student becomes a teacher of the White student on a new and challenging task. After this experience, interracial groups exhibit markedly less White dominance than untreated groups (Cohen & Roper, 1972).

Expectation Training has been successfully replicated in this country (Riordan, 1978); in Canada with Whites and Indians (Cook, 1974) and in Israel with middle Eastern and Western Jews (Cohen & Sharan, 1977).

In the racially integrated classroom, one can expect to face the problem of general expectations for competence based on race as a diffuse status characteristic. In addition, the conventional classroom contains a status order based on academic skill. Those children who are seen as better in school skills tend to dominate those who are ranked as poorer students--even when the task does not demand any academic skills. Hoffman originally demonstrated this effect in junior high school social studies classes (1973). Subsequently, Rosenholtz, using Reading Ability as a Status Characteristic, showed how groups of mixed reading ability were dominated by High Readers on a non-reading task

(1977). The process of status generalization based on Reading Ability works much like the process based on racial and ethnic differences.

In many integrated classrooms, the children of ethnic and racial minority background are lower social class, and thus do less well in reading, writing and arithmetic than middle class Whites. Thus the educator interested in equal status relations faces the double problem of two status orders which are positively associated.

The Multiple Ability approach was an alternative treatment based on Expectation States Theory and designed for problems of reading status. Stulac originally conceptualized this approach; she told children of mixed reading status that they were about to do a task which required a number of different abilities. No one child could expect to be good at all these activities, but each child would be good at one. Furthermore, none of these abilities required reading. After experiencing a problem solving task defined in this way, the High Readers no longer dominated the Low Readers on the standard criterion task (Stulac, 1975).

Rosenholtz developed this approach into a one week curriculum called the Multiple Abilities Curriculum (MAC). The idea behind the curriculum is to develop in the children a mixed set of evaluations on three new abilities. Expectations for competence based on these new abilities become relevant to future tasks, thereby weakening the effect of expectations based purely on reading ability. The curriculum teaches the children that many different intellectual abilities are used to solve important problems. Unlike Stulac's approach, Rosenholtz does not tell the children that the tasks they experience are unrelated to reading.

The Rosenholtz experiment with the MAC was the first to take place in a conventional classroom. Despite the many chances for reinforcement of

expectations of competence and incompetence of high and low readers by past evaluations and grades, Rosenholtz was able to modify the domination of higher-ranking readers in a one week curriculum (1977).

Moving into classrooms. The Rosenholtz classroom experiment was far removed from the original "scope conditions" of Expectation States Theory. Scope conditions give the circumstances which are sufficient for status generalization to take place. In addition to specifying a mixed status group and a collective task, the theory also specifies that the group be differentiated only on status characteristics--there should be no other basis for making evaluations of each other. Classroom studies violate this last condition dramatically. Children have known each other for some time and have many alternative bases for evaluating each other. They interact in the school yard, in the neighborhood as well as in the classroom. Hoffman and Rosenholtz controlled for these informal interactions by matching their subjects on perceived social influence in the classroom. Their success in showing clear effects of expectations based on academic status in groups matched on social influence emboldened us to think we could move into integrated classrooms. Even though we were facing two status characteristics (race and academic status) we too could relax this scope condition and study the operation of expectations for competence. We too could control the operation of informal social interaction by simply matching group members on their perceptions of each other as personally influential.

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This field experiment was designed to test the effectiveness of the Multiple Ability Curriculum (MAC) and Expectation Training in racially desegregated classrooms. Because we expected increased difficulties in treating two status orders: race and academic status, one of the conditions represented a combination of the two treatments: MAC plus Expectation Training. The second

treatment condition was the MAC alone. The third condition was a set of untreated classrooms functioning as a control.

Classrooms in the experiment came from three schools in the San Francisco Bay Area. Schools were selected which had approximately 50% minority racial and ethnic enrollment. Each classroom represented a wide range of social class background with most of the minority children of markedly lower social class than the majority children.

The Bay Area has few schools with these characteristics; of those with the desired composition, even fewer had principals and teachers willing to cooperate with Stanford researchers and observers over a two year period. Thus, the sample had three schools from three different communities. One school which we shall call Wordsworth, provided most of the classrooms for the study; it was a very large Grades 4-6 school. Within each school, a subset of fifth and sixth grade teachers volunteered to participate in the study.

In each school, classrooms were assigned randomly to treatment from within strata of different instructional characteristics. Previous research had shown that instructional characteristics were associated with the strength of consensus on a rank order of reading ability among the children (Rosenholtz & Wilson, 1978). Baseline study of cooperating classrooms revealed a wide variation along the critical dimensions of standardization of classroom tasks and competition in evaluation procedures. Some used traditional large group instruction combined with individual seatwork. Others featured individualization with no competitive evaluation practices, using some work in small groups.

Three strata of instructional types were created on the basis of questionnaires given to teachers and children as well as classroom observations. Classrooms in the lowest stratum were the most competitive and used most large group instruction. These features theoretically encourage the formation of a strong

clear status order on academic ability. Classrooms in the highest category used more small group work, individualization and less formal grading; these were classrooms where the academic status order was expected to operate less strongly. The remaining classrooms were intermediate on these instructional patterns.

Figure I presents the design of the experiment. Each square represents a fifth or sixth grade classroom in one of three schools. As one can see from the figure Schools II and III had few classrooms involved. These were much smaller schools; and as a consequence we will say less about them.

Figure I about here

Experimental Procedures

The basic format of the curriculum was the same as in the Rosenholtz experiment. Small groups of students participated in tasks representing each of three new abilities: Reasoning, Visual Thinking, and Intuitive Thinking. The curriculum ran for one hour per day for a week. Each day mixed sex, interracial groups were reformed with a new combination of high and low ranking readers. tasks were engineered so that no one child could dominate the interaction and so that everyone would participate and be reasonably successful.

With each small group was an adult from the multi-racial teaching team, especially created for administration of this curriculum. Previous research had demonstrated that the organizational context of a status treatment must not illustrate dominance of adults with high social status; such modeling may negate the effectiveness of the treatment (Robbins, 1977). Therefore, the staff was multi-racial; these highly skilled adults modeled equal status behavior for the children. In their role as group leader they made sure that each task followed the proper procedure and that each child was able to participate successfully.

To make the curriculum as strong as possible, the teaching team put a special stress on norms for sharing, equal participation and cooperation. Morris had shown that the introduction of norms for equal participation was effective as a simple strategy for reducing the dominance of better readers in groups of mixed academic status students (Morris, 1977). The treatment then actually combined the Rosenholtz MAC with Morris' strategy of introducing norms for equal participation in work groups. Each new ability was introduced with a special film showing an interracial caste using the ability to solve important, real-life problems. Actors were children and adults; sex stereotyping was avoided. After the film for each ability, a team member would conduct a discussion with the children, having them draw examples of the new ability from their own experience. During the group work, team members took every opportunity to point out how the abilities were being used in the task.

Experimental procedures: expectation training. A second multi-racial staff came into the schools to carry out Expectation Training. In those classrooms which were to receive both treatments, students receiving a low ranking in reading ability from classmates were selected and called out for special training. With careful tutorial supervision, they learned how to take apart and put back together an intricate plastic puzzle. They were also trained to teach this task to another student. When a student reached a criterion level of competence, s/he was videotaped while teaching an adult the task. Higher ranking readers were then called out of the classroom and were assigned to one of the trained students. Both members of the mixed status pair then viewed the videotape of the competent student-teacher. The Low Reader taught the High Reader how to manipulate the puzzle, directing and controlling his/her behavior. This session was taped and played back to the pair.

Following this experience, the adult trainer took the Low Readers aside and explained that the self-confident, competent behavior they had exhibited during the teaching episode would be relevant and valuable for the criterion task they were about to experience. This is called the Relevance Bond.

These procedures have become standard in Expectation Training studies. Even though the staff was operating under difficult field conditions, they were successful in producing criterion level competence in each student and in carrying out videotaping and the playbacks with reinforcement procedures. The entire staff was made up of graduate students; they understood the fundamental principles of the treatment and were committed to making each student-teacher genuinely competent and successful.

Measurement procedures. The year before the intervention, the staff collected observation and questionnaire information on classroom social structure, school climate and teacher's instructional practices. They also ran some interracial four-person groups on the standard criterion task of Shoot-the-Moon in order to estimate the extent to which Whites and better readers would dominate Blacks, Browns, and lower ranking readers.

Just before the intervention, the children filled out a sociometric instrument ranking each other on reading ability, social influence, and friendship. This instrument was used to compose groups for the curriculum, for Expectation Training, and for the measurement of treatment effects.

Following treatment, pairs of children were composed and called out of their classes to play Shoot-the-Moon in front of the video cameras. This game requires the players to make decisions as a team as to which way they will proceed on the game board. The Host Experimenter rolls a die which determines how many spaces the playing piece advances down the path chosen by the team. Each square on the board indicates how many points are added or subtracted to

the total score. The goal is to reach the moon in 14 turns, gaining as many points as possible. By scoring the interaction over approximately 14 decisions, we can measure the activity and influence of members of different status.

There were several short questionnaires administered, one after the MAC and one after the playing of Shoot-the-Moon. A final round of measurement was taken toward the end of the school year; the sociometric instrument was readministered at that time.

RESULTS

Power and Status in Participating Classrooms

The three participating schools are not typical of desegregated schools described in the literature. They are unusual in three ways. The racial composition is 50% White and 50% racial and ethnic minorities. In each school the Whites are of much higher socio-economic status than the Blacks or Chicanos. In Wordsworth, 50% of the students are Black; the Asians tend to be middle class along with the Whites. Secondly, there is very little resegregation inside the school. Each classroom represents the same racial mixture as the school; and there is almost no tracking. Thirdly, each of these schools makes a vigorous effort to include multi-cultural components in the curriculum.

Data on reading rank. Each student was asked to rank every other student in class of his/her own sex on how good they were at reading. Children showed a high level of agreement on this rank order, even in the fall when they had not been together very long. There was variation in the degree of agreement (as measured by Kendall's coefficient of concordance) between boys and girls in the same classroom and considerable variation from one classroom to another. Overall, the level of agreement increased from fall to spring. In the spring, the teachers ranked their students on reading ability; there was a high correlation between teacher and student ranking.

Overall, more of the lower-ranked readers were Black or Chicano than higher-ranked readers. In Wordsworth, examination of the average rank in each class and sex cohort, shows that of the three lowest ranking readers, 84 are Black and 31 are White. Of the three best readers, 28 are Black and 70 are White. Despite the strength of the overall association between reading rank and race, the association inside each classroom is not as great as the association for the school as a whole. For example, there was one classroom in Wordsworth where there were no Blacks named as the three highest or lowest for the boys or the girls' ranking.

Baseline studies of classmates playing Shoot-the-Moon, showed marked dominance of higher ranking readers over lower ranking readers. In Wordsworth, there were eight four-person groups with two White High Readers and two Black Low Readers. The videotapes were scored for successful influence of each actor in forming the group decisions. High Readers accounted for 61.4% of the successful influence scores; and Low Readers accounted for 38.6% of the successful influence. Also, there were six all-Black groups with High and Low ranking readers; in these groups the percentages of successful influence for High and Low Readers were exactly the same as in interracial groups. We concluded that there was strong evidence of status generalization; reading ability was a specific status characteristic operating in this school. The effect of differences in reading status were visible in interracial and in all Black groups. Evidently, expectations for competence based on reading can and do spread to tasks that have nothing to do with academic skills.

Relationship of social power to reading status. It is not unusual to find that academic status is a major basis for social influence in elementary school classrooms. Table 1 gives the correlations of social influence and reading rank calculated from sociometric data taken just before the treatment.

Table 1 about here

Each student was asked to list the three same-sex classmates who were " most able to get you to do things" and the three who were "least able to get you to do things." Attributed Power Score is a measure of social influence; it is calculated from the number of choices going to each student on the question on influence. The number of choices a student receives as most influential minus the number of choices that students received as least influential is divided by the number of student choices and multiplied by 100. The reading rank score for these correlations is the average rank attributed to each student.

Unlike most classrooms, there is not a statistically significant association between reading rank and attributed power. Out of the 44 correlations for each sex and classroom group, there are only five which show a significant positive relationship. There are four with a significant negative relationship. Although the direction is typically a positive one, the rest are not statistically significant. Evidently, in these interracial classrooms, social power has a basis which bears no systematic relationship to reading status, whether for boys or girls. It is also the case that there are many socially powerful Black students who receive a relatively low reading rank. The minority children are by no means powerless in many of these classes despite their low academic status.

Black Power

To capture the concept of social power attributed to Blacks, we calculated a simple statistic of the proportion of White choices going to Black students as socially influential. This statistic does not take into account the number of Blacks in the classroom, but is allowed to reflect Black dominance whether

it comes about through sheer numbers of Blacks or through other means. This is the Black Power Index; it represents a purely contextural measure of the extent to which Blacks are seen as influential by Whites in the classroom.

The average value of this index for Wordsworth is 48% although the index value varies considerably by classroom. For the girls, the value of the Black Power Index is closely related to the number of Black girls in the classroom ($r = .70$). This is much less the case for boys ($r = .217$) where alternative sources of power such as physique and athletic prowess may determine the number of influential Black male students.

In Wordsworth, the Black children were more often selected than the White children as socially powerful. In 10 out of 26 comparisons, Whites chose more Blacks than would be expected by chance as socially influential.

The organizational characteristics of the school as discussed above, are probably responsible for this social structure and interracial dynamic. This is especially the case with Wordsworth where the power of the Blacks in the organizational context of the school is marked. Not only do Black children constitute 50% or more of the student body, but there are many powerful Black faculty members. At the time of the study the principal was Asian; and the Vice-Principal was Black. Social studies included Black History; the music program featured Black Spirituals which were sung with great enthusiasm by both Blacks and Whites. The PTA was active and predominantly Black.

Because of the authoritative and legitimate status of Black adults and Black culture in this school, the White students see some Black students as highly influential. Whites often choose Blacks as close friends. Although ability in reading does function as a strong status characteristic, there are alternative sources of status and power in these classrooms which have a profound effect in interracial interaction.

Evaluation of the Curriculum

Students should form new evaluations of themselves on the three abilities as a result of experiencing the small group tasks of the MAC. If the curriculum has worked properly, two things should happen: 1) Few children should experience failure; and 2) The better readers should not feel that they are more successful in the new abilities than the poorer readers.

In order to examine the success of the curriculum, we administered a questionnaire in the classroom following the experience. Each child was asked to rank him/herself in comparison to classmates on the three new abilities. Responses were "Below Average," "Above Average" and "Average."

A simple examination of the number of children ranking themselves "Below Average" reveals that very few felt this way about any single ability. Out of 541 treated students, only 16 ranked themselves below average. One hundred and fifty-six ranked themselves "Above Average" and the remainder called themselves "Average."

Rank order correlations between average reading rank of the individual and self-evaluation on the three abilities are shown for each classroom receiving the curriculum in Table 2. A negative correlation coefficient indicates that there is a positive association between reading rank and self-evaluation. Out of 12 classrooms, there were only three negative relationships reaching statistical significance. In each case this association between reading rank and self-evaluation occurred for only one of the three abilities in that classroom. Thus, there is every reason to believe that the curriculum was successful in producing a mixed set of evaluations on competence which bear no consistent relationship to perceived competence on reading.

Table 2 about here

The staff reported enthusiastic reception of the tasks. The classroom teacher was asked to stay in the room during the curriculum because we wanted her/him to observe the behavior of children in this different setting. Teachers were interviewed about their observations and evaluations. Selected excerpts are given below:

> From the standpoint of a classroom teacher, your respective groups of students were well mixed, that is the high ability and low-achievers were put together. I think that the mixed ability integrated small group is interesting and the way your organized them.
>
> The games were intrinsically interesting to every child. I don't know how well the children got those principles, but I like the way you were trying to get them across--cooperation, taking turns,--and not relying on one child to mastermind the whole situation.
>
> One of the things I have noticed is you make sure that the kids who in some way or another, you perceive as not being the high achiever--you were able to pull them in. I remember at one time when some reading was being done, and I noticed that the readers were the kids who were not the strong readers, and that was very good. Arniz, for instance, has been totally animated about your coming in; it just brightens him up. He really looked forward to it, and this was true for a lot of kids. Another one is Greer, who needs a lot of learning assistance--he is really into it. So the kids have a terrific feeling about the whole thing.
>
> I had a discussion with the kids when you left yesterday. One of the questions I asked is this: I see you were really enjoying the games: What is it that happens to you that makes all these interesting to you? And I gathered from several of the kids say, "They (the staff) showed us that we were thinking when we didn't even know we were thinking."
>
> I have six behavior problems that I thought were in varying degrees able to handle the situation very well. It is encouraging to see this happening because it is saying to me that in a certain given situation, you can involve the children in activities, and be able to keep the less positive behavior from surfacing.--Even among some of my negative behaving children, the activity itself was not reinforcing their negative habits--their hasseling, their teasing, their aggressiveness.

> Some of the activities too taught some kind of leadership. Those who have been leaders in the class can re-evaluate their own roles as leaders; they could not always be dominating, so that they have to bring out leadership qualities in other people too. Some of the tasks draw out whatever information a particular student has, to the group; this allows leadership to spread out and change. There were situations, for example, where a group had no leader, but had to come out with everybody working together and sharing. The kids too found that they can work together and are more able to find the activities enjoyable.

Behavior on Shoot-the-Moon

In order to measure the effects of treatment on behavior, we selected 116 pairs of students from treated and untreated classrooms. These pairs of classmates played Shoot-the-Moon at video stations set up in the school. Measurement occurred the week following the end of the MAC. Until this experiment, four-person groups were the standard procedure. However, in this study, we wanted to estimate effects for each classroom; and it is not possible to compose a sufficient number of four-person groups, controlling on the required variables in a single classroom. Therefore, we made the decision to move to pairs.

Composition of pairs. Using data from the sociometric question, we chose pairs who were differentiated on perceived reading ability. The "High" and "Low" Reader perceived each other as at least three ranks apart, on the item where students ranked all members of their own sex in class. Some pairs were Black; most of these were in Wordsworth. All other pairs contained a White High Reader and a Black or Brown Low Reader.

There were a number of controls on the selection of pairs. No pair contained children who named each other as one of their three closest friends. All pairs were of the same sex and came from the same classroom. As in earlier studies, the children were matched on perception of social influence, using the item on the sociometric questionnaire. Some pairs were composed of students who saw each other as very influential, others contained students who named each other as least influential; and the rest had not named each other on the

influence question. These strict controls on personally perceived influence are important to remember in understanding the significance of the results.

There were, in all, 116 pairs of students who played the game. Due to various technical problems, we were unable to score 19 of the tapes on all the measures; thus there were 97 pairs with all relevant influence measures. Twenty-eight of these pairs are Black, differentiated by reading status. The remaining 69 have a White High Reader and Black or Brown Low Reader.

Influence measures. The tapes were scored for several measures of the influence process. Every third tape was scored by a second observer for a reliability check. Standards for reliability were very high; many tapes were completely rescored because there was evidence of systematic disagreement. In the final scoring of the number of unique suggestions given by each actor, there was 94.2% agreement on scores given to actors in every third tape.

The two measures relevant to this report are: Unique Suggestions and Influence. Each actor was scored for the number of unique suggestions, verbal or non-verbal as to which way to proceed on the game board. As a meas. of influence, the person whose suggestion was accepted by the pair for each turn was scored as "successful influence."

A percentage of all scores on each of these measures was calculated for Low and High Reader. These two measures are highly intercorrelated ($r = .67$). Successful Influence is the less desirable measure because there were 14 or less influence scores to be assigned to the pair. Calculating a percentage influence with such a small denominator produces a statistic with a high variance. Unique suggestions, as a measure of performance output, is a theoretically reasonable measure of the influence process with better statistical properties.

Using percentage of Unique Suggestions, an index of Expectancy Advantage is calculated by subtracting the percentage for the Low Reader from that of the High Reader. If the Expectancy Advantage of pairs in a category averages to 0%, then the behavior is considered "equal status." If the average Expectancy Advantage is positive, then the High Reader is more active and influential than the Low Reader. If the average figure is negative, then the Low Reader is dominant.

Effects of treatment. The first examination of the results was baffling. There were no clear effects of treatment; some of the untreated classrooms showed little sign of a reading status characteristic. We proceeded by examining possibly confounding variables, eliminating them one by one. We had eliminated a number of these, when we discovered the powerful effects of the variables called Attributed Social Power and the Black Power Index. Only when these are taken into account do the data become meaningful.

As described above, many of the classrooms contain highly influential Blacks who are nonetheless low in Reading Ability. Despite the fact that we had matched pairs on interpersonal perceptions of social influence, pairs did differ on how influential each member was in the eyes of classmates: the Attributed Power Score. In other words, although the two might both perceive each other as highly influential, the Black Low Reader might be seen as highly influential by many other members of the class while the White High Reader, might be seen as highly influential by only a few classmates.

If we examine the Attributed Power Score of the Low and High Reader of each pair, it becomes abundantly clear that many of the pairs had Low Readers who were more socially powerful than the High Readers. Out of the 97 tapes, 48 had Low Readers who had the same or higher Attributed Power than the High Reader. Attributed power is a powerful predictor of interpersonal behavior on the game.

Table 3 shows the pairs divided as to whether the Attributed Power Score of the Low Reader is less than that of the High Reader. These pairs appear in the upper half of the table. In the lower half are the pairs where the Low Reader has the same or higher Attributed Power than the High Readers. The pairs are further sub-divided to treatment condition. An average expectancy advantage is calculated for the set of pairs falling into each cell of the table.

Table 3 about here

The average expectancy advantages for all pairs where the Attributed Power of the Low Reader is the same or higher than that of the High Reader is -.004. Thus, behavior is, on the average, almost perfectly equal status when the Attributed Power of the Low Reader matches or exceeds that of the High Reader.

In the upper half of the table, the average figures show less of an expectancy advantage for the High Reader in the treated as compared to the control condition. The combined treatment condition (MAC + ET) is the closest to equal status behavior. The MAC is intermediate in its effects (the High Reader has an expectancy advantage of 12.4%). The untreated pairs show an average of 20% expectancy advantage of the High Reader. Examination of the pairs where the Low Reader is more than 20 points lower in Attributed Power than the High Reader, as compared to pairs where the power inbalance is less severe, suggests that Attributed Power of the Low Reader, if it is very low, can contribute to marked depression in the unique suggestion rate.

From a statistical point of view, it is most unfortunate that there are only five cases of pairs where the Low Reader is markedly lower in Attributed Power where the pair received both MAC and Expectation Training. This is the cell where we would be most able to see dramatic effects of treatment and we have very few pairs for study.

In order to estimate the simultaneous effects of Reading Status, Treatment Condition and Attributed Power, a multiple regression on successful influence of all subjects was carried out. Table 4 shows the Beta Weights and F scores for each of the predictors in the analysis. For the purpose of this analysis, the status of the subject on reading ability is entered as a dummy variable, Low or High. The treatment conditions are also handled as dummy variables.

Table 4 about here

The results of this analysis illustrate a number of important findings. Note the power of Reading Status in predicting successful influence. The treatment variables were entered into the equation first. Despite the possibly helpful effects of treatment, being Low on the reading characteristic powerfully depressed the probability of successful influence. Working the opposite way, is the Attributed Power variable. The higher the Attributed Power Score, the higher the probability of successful influence, regardless of status on reading or treatment.

In this analysis, where we examine all the subjects together, the effects of treatment are utterly "swamped" by the contradictory forces of Attributed Power and Reading Ability.

Next let us turn to a statistical analysis of those pairs where Attributed Power of the Low Reader was less than or equal to the Attributed Power of the High Reader. From a theoretical point of view, over half of the pairs demonstrate a condition of disequilibrium which is quite beyond present theoretical developments. In other words, there is no theory to tell us how to predict the effect of competence manipulations when the situation is already one of mixed expectations.

For this analysis we regressed the two power variables and treatment on the expectancy advantage of the High Reader in each pair. The unit of analysis is the pair; the dependent variable is the percentage of unique suggestions given by the High Reader minus the percentage of unique suggestions given by the Low Reader. Attributed Power appears as "Power Difference;" it is the difference in Attributed Power score between the High and Low Readers. The Black Power Index represents the proportion of Blacks chosen by Whites on the influence questions, for the class and sex group in which the pair was located.

Table 5 gives the intercorrelations of the two power variables and the two influence measures. Each of the power measures is signficantly negatively related to the Expectancy Advantage of the High Reader. As the power difference score grows larger (Attributed Power of Low Reader - Attributed Power of High Reader) grows larger, the Expectancy Advantage of the High Reader decreases. Likewise, the larger the proportion of highly influential Blacks in the eyes of White classmates, the less was the expectancy advantage of the High Reader over the Low Readers (who were always Black or Brown). The two measures of the influence process are, as expected, highly intercorrelated ($r = .679$). Lastly the two power measures are not related to each other.

Table 5 about here

Table 6 represents the Standardized Coefficients for treatments and power variables, regressed on Expectancy Advantage. Note that this regression is carried out only on the 48 pairs where the Attributed Power of the Low Reader is less than or equal to that of the High Reader. The treatments are entered as dummy variables.

Table 6 about here

As in the previous regression, the effect of treatment pales beside that of the power variables. Even within this half of the sample, the Attributed Power Score continues to be a powerful predictor. Pairs where the Power of the Low Reader was much below that of the High Reader show more of an Expectancy Advantage than pairs where the power scores were equal or almost equal. Quite independent of this effect of Attributed Power is the contextural effect of Black Power Index. If the pair is located in a class-sex group where Blacks are powerful, the Black or Brown Low Reader makes more unique suggestions relative to the High Reader. This effect is quite independent of the personal influence of the members of the pair.

Post Game Questionnaire

Students who played Shoot-the-Moon filled out a questionnaire right after the game. Students put down which of the two had the better ideas and chose the leader. The answers to these questions provide a useful supplementary analysis of the effects of treatment. In the past, these items have been highly correlated with the result of systematic scoring of behavior.

Table 7 gives the results for the questions on perceived competence and leadership. Many students, under all three conditions answered, "Both of Us." This accounts for thevariation in N of choices in the table. Pairs are again divided according to relative Attributed Power. Their percentage entries are the probabilities of the Low Reader being chosen when respondents were willing to choose one person.

Table 7 about here

Again, we can only make predictions about the effects of treatment where Attributed Power of the Low Reader is less than equal to that of the High Reader. On perception of intellectual competence (having better ideas), only 33% of the Low Readers are chosen in the control condition. This improves

somewhat in the treated conditions to 41% for the MAC condition and 43% of the Low Readers chosen after MAC plus Expectation Training.

The item on leadership shows only 35% of the Low Readers chosen among pairs from untreated classrooms. This proportion rises slightly to 41% for those receiving MAC. There is a sharp increase to 56% of Low Readers chosen as leader among those who received MAC and Expectation Training. It should be noted that the pairs who played Shoot-the-Moon were not the same pair who played the teacher and student roles on the plastic puzzle. This is not a specific evaluation of the particular person who had just played the role of teacher. Choices for leaderhip in this condition were just as likely to come from the High Reader as the Low. Even when the Low Reader had very low Attributed Power (-10 or less), he/she was just as likely to be chosen leader as the High Reader.

INTERPRETATION

Behavior on the criterion task following treatment reflected two opposing forces. On one side, the sharp academic status differences in these classrooms resulted in a strong tendency for the Low Reader to make fewer suggestions and become less influenctial than the High Reader. On the other side, many of the Low Readers were seen as highly influential by their classmates. This social influence, characteristic of informal interpersonal relationships, produced influential behavior on the Shoot-the-Moon game, boosting the activity and influence of many of the Low Readers. These opposing effects on the influence of actors on Shoot-the-Moon are clearly shown in Table 3, where reading status has a depressing effect on the influence of the Low Reader and Attributed Power has a positive effect on influence of all actors.

Social influence in these classrooms is often independent of academic status (Table 1); many of the poor readers are seen as influential. This social situation is quite unlike the situation in the classrooms of many previous

studies and the classrooms of the Rosenholtz study. The findings in Table 3 suggest that academic status is very important to these students. However, there are alternative bases of social influence which produce influential behavior on Shoot-the-Moon on the part of many low-ranked readers who are Black.

Effects of Treatment

The special conditions of these three schools, especially Wordsworth, makes it very difficult to see the effects of treatment. We are trying to see the effects of assigning competence to students low on the reading characteristic, but there are stronger natural forces boosting the influence and activity of the Low Readers. The strongest of these "natural treatments" is attributed power, a reputational element probably developing out of informal interpersonal interactions inside and outside the classroom.

For over half the pairs who played Shoot-the-Moon there is a state of disequilibrium of these two forces. The Attributed Power of the Low Reader is higher than that of the High, but the status characteristic of reading is evidently simultaeously at work as a source of influence for the High Reader. The first regression clearly shows the effects of Attributed Power and reading status working in opposite directions (Table 3). In Table 4 one can see that the expectancy advantage of the High Reader is highest when the Attributed Power of the Low Reader is the lowest (relative to that of the High Reader). As the difference in power decreases toward zero, the expectancy advantage of the High Reader systematically decreases. When the power difference shifts toward the point where the Low Reader is Higher than that of the High Reader, we do not continue to see a linear decrease in expectancy advantage (Power Difference is uncorrelated with Expectancy Advantage in this half of the sample). The effect of the academic status variable may be to prevent the expectancy advantage from

moving clearly onto the negative side; the results hover around equal status behavior.

It is impossible to make predictions for what will be the effects of a competence manipulation on the half of the sample where we see such disequilibrium. This is a profound violation of the scope conditions of Expectation States Theory. No one, at the present time, can tell us what one should expect in the way of activity and influence rates when there is such a mixed set of expectations in operation. It looks as if there were some sort of combining effect of expectations derived from the position of power and prestige in the informal world of the students and expectations based on academic status.

Turning to the half of the sample where the Low Reader is lower on both academic status and Attributed Power, there are comparatively few cases left on which to estimate effects of treatment. It is certainly impossible to talk about the effects of treatment on schools or individual classrooms. Even in this half of the sample, it is difficult to disentangle the effects of treatment from the effects of Attributed Power, both of which presumably reduce the expectancy advantage. The effects of treatment are probably small in the face of the power variables arising from longer-term social forces.

In retrospect, the decision to use two-person groups was probably an unfortunate one. This situation seems ideally calculated to reflect informal interpersonal power. If we had run four-person groups, some of the Attributed Power effects of individuals might have canceled each other out. From a theoretical point of view there are alternative ways to measure the effects of the competence manipulation, such as the willingness of the children to become engaged in new intellectual tasks in a setting not so open to free-swinging interpersonal interaction. We would have been more successful in seeing effects of the treatment, if we had used such measures.

What can be said about the effects of treatment? First, there is good evidence that the MAC worked as intended to form new ability conceptions, where Low Readers had equally high competence expectations as High Readers. The analysis of the post-curriculum questionnaire demonstrates this finding

Secondly, examination of the means in Table 4 shows a consistent effect of the treatments in lowering the Expectancy Advantage of the High Readers. Expectation Training plus Multiple Ability Curriculum appears to have the strongest effect, while MAC alone appears to have a very small effect. In all probability, MAC is not able, by itself, to change the activity and influence rates of Low Readers who are also powerless in this situation.

The failure of the treatment variables to show up as significant predictors in the regression analysis might lead one to "write them off" except for the findings on the post-meeting questionnaire. These findings add strength to the interpretation that Expectation Training was an important addition to the new ability conceptions formed by the curriculum. This treatment places the Low Reader in a position of authority and expertise as a teacher. The effect of this feature of the treatment is reflected in the probability of the Low Reader being chosen as leader after Shoot-the-Moon. Even when the relative power of the Low Reader is very low, Expectation Training plus MAC results in a 56% probability of the Low Reader being chosen as leader. This is a marked improvement over the probability of being chosen as leader in the untreated pairs. On the whole, we conclude that treatments which form new ability conceptions combined with treatments designed to boost the power of these Low Power Low Readers are both necessary for equal status behavior with these kinds of students. In other words, when we are dealing with powerless Low Readers, one has to do something about the powerlessness as well as something about the generally low expectations for competence.

Social Power as a Natural Treatment

In many ways, the most interesting results of this experiment were the unexpected and favorable effects of the two power variables in producing equal status behavior. This appears to be an exciting natural treatment; educators can take advantage of it if they understand its potential. In classrooms where there are alternative and informal sources of social power among the "weaker students" teachers are often concerned about their ability to undermine the formal authority and value system. However, I would argue that in classrooms such as these, the influential Black students who are seen as poorer readers are relatively easy to work with. Their social standing has resulted in their being seen as "smart" and "able." This alternative conception of ability prevents their feeling generally incompetent. Although some boys may be influential through coercion, I do not think the data support this case by and large.

On the Shoot-the-Moon questionnaire, Low Readers with high relative Attributed Power were often seen as having the "better ideas." If the High Reader had conformed out of fear of retaliation, he/she would not have been likely to choose the Low Reader as more competent on a private questionnaire. Even more impressive is the observational evidence for the role played by some Black children in these schools. The staff was in and out of these schools for two years. They uniformly reported on the lively, active Black children who co-opted the observers, their classmates and their teachers. On the playground, they could be seen organizing the activities and arbitrating the disputes. In the classrooms, they were often on the move, talking with Black and White classmates, joking, arguing, negotiating. Even on the children's questionnaires, the Blacks report more academic participation and

teacher assistance than the Whites at Wordsworth. Out of all this lively interaction comes an alternative conception of what it is to be "smart." Children who are fortunate enough to be seen in this light need no special treatment of expectations for competence in preparation for small group work. They will be active and influential in group work, even on academic tasks.

Perhaps the most interesting finding of all is the finding of a second power variable, independent of the first, which also has the effect of boosting the activity rate of the Black Low Reader. This is the Black Power Index which proved to be a significant predictor of Expectancy Advantage, holding constant the effects of Attributed Power. This variable refers to a specifically racial dynamic. It does not refer to the personal standing of the Low Reader, but to the standing of Blacks, as a group, in the eyes of Whites in the classroom. When Whites choose many Blacks as most influential, the activity rate of the Black Low Readers, as a group, is boosted. It is as if the standing of one's race in the context of the classroom has an effect on one's willingness to speak up and make suggestions in interaction with Whites.

There was marked variation in the Black Power Index between sex groups and classrooms. On the whole, in the two schools where the proportion of Blacks is smaller, it tends to be lower. The Black Power Index is probably a reflection of organizational characteristics. This is not the first study to find that Whites are less dominant in interaction when the organizational context speaks to Black Power. Iadacola used a collective task and measured the interaction of Blacks, Browns, and Whites in schools with varying organizational characteristics. He found that the dominance of Anglos was lessened in schools where there were more minority students, where there was better minority representation on the staff and where minority cultural concerns were included in the curriculum.

Wordsworth is a fine example of a school where Black adults, Black culture and the racial composition are all conducive to powerful Black Influence.

This is a special dynamic operating in some of the integrated classrooms; it is not a reflection of hostile coercion of Whites by Blacks who have frightened them. We have studied the climate of interpersonal behavior at Wordsworth. Although aggressive behavior is common, the report of incidents of interracial aggression is closely correlated with reports of more general interpersonal aggression. Conflict is not specifically interracial; this is, however a rather lower class school climate where people are allowed to treat each other by pushing, shoving, name calling and worse. Aggressive behavior is not taking place in the well-run classrooms, but elsewhere in the school. Many classrooms show a high proportion of Whites choosing Blacks as "closest personal friends." The proportion of White friendship choices going to Blacks often approximates the chance model that would be obtained if there were no racial barriers to friendship.

In classrooms where the Black Power Index is high, it has become legitimate and proper for Blacks to tell Whites what to do. Conversely, in those schools and classrooms where the Black Power Index is very low it is not legitimate for Blacks and Browns to tell Whites what to do. This is a special problem of powerlessness, quite different than the problem of status characteristics and conceptions of ability. It probably requires a direct attack on the problem of powerlessness. In one of the three schools where the proportion of Blacks is the smallest, the Black Power Index is weakest. I would argue that despite the excellent program of individualization, the strong multicultural curriculum, and the exceptionally harmonious interpersonal climate, it is the hardest for this school to produce equal status behavior because of the powerlessness of

each of the constituent low-status racial minority groups. Not only will they have to foster multiple ability conceptions, but they will have to provide leadership opportunities for the members of the minority groups.

IMPLICATIONS

Integrated classrooms are clearly more complex than we had envisioned. It was true that differences in academic status had strong effects on behavior. There was strong evidence of concensus on a rank order on reading ability which can and does function to depress the activity and influence of Low Readers on non-academic tasks. From a practitioner's point of view, this means that attempts to improve the participation of poor performers by setting up cooperative situations are likely to be met by failure. Although cooperative group work is now being recommended for integrated classrooms, setting up such tasks will often activate the reading status characteristic and act to depress the participation of minority children who are poor readers.

The success of the Multiple Ability Curriculum in fostering evaluations of new intellectual abilities in children who are seen as poor readers, suggests that it is practical and feasible to make the curriculum for the integrated classroom a "multiple ability" experience, where different intellectual skills are defined and valued; and different children are allowed to excell in different dimensions of ability.

The results of this experiment suggest that one should not think in a simple additive fashion about the effects of racial and academic status orders operating on interracial behavior. This behavior is evidently also affected by the social influence of Black children developed in informal interracial interaction. In schools, such as Wordsworth, where the staff composition and curriculum include Black authority figures and Black culture, and where the racial composition is 50% Black, many Black children who are poor readers are influential in the eyes

of White children. This influence seems to have an alternative basis to academic status and functions like an alternative conception of ability. Furthermore, the fact that many Blacks are influential in the eyes of Whites functions to boost the assertiveness and self-confidence of Blacks, in general as they interact with Whites.

Power in the organizational context appears to act as a treatment for status problems. Iadacola's work on a larger desegregated sample, shows how minority staff and student racial composition as well as multicultural curricula are associated with increased activity and influence of minority students in a group interaction situation. Robbins' study of the racial composition and behavior of an experimental staff showed that Expectation Training was effective in producing equal status behavior between Chicanos and Anglos only when an interracial pair of adults modeled equal status behavior (1977). Finally, Huguenin, in her study of teachers and lower status parents in discussing a standardized school problem, found less teacher dominance when parents, in general, were allowed to play powerful roles in the Urban Rural School Development School Site Councils (1978). One of the ways in which power probably affects behavior is to tell the participants that it is legitimate for lower status members to speak up and tell higher status members what to do. This effect of power may be independent of the issue of perceived competence for the task at hand.

In analyzing desegregated classrooms it is essential to understand this dimension of power and influence. If there is an alternative basis for social influence, such as we found in some classrooms in this study, then the teacher needs two kinds of approaches, one for the low academic status students who are socially powerful and one for low status students who are powerless. Improving the academic skills of those low ranking students who are socially powerful

should not be difficult. They are the ideal candidates for cooperative group work, on academic tasks. They will not require a multiple ability treatment prior to engaging in cooperative group work. They are likely to be enthusiastic participants in an intellectual task where social interaction is required. We saw this kind of response to group work introduced into the classroom in Wordsworth by the staff, after the end of the intervention. Teachers were amazed to see how motivated some of these lively "troublemakers" were in solving group academic problems.

If the teacher provides individualized instruction for these students with appropriate and challenging tasks in the basic skills and realistic praise and reinforcement, their fundamental sense of intellectual competence should help to boost their willingness to put in sustained effort in areas where they have had difficulty. Competition should be avoided in the basic skills because it will aggravate the effects of academic status order (Awang-Had, 1972).

Dealing with students who are low in academic skills and status as well as powerless in the social setting is much harder. In the integrated schools it seems especially difficult to treat these children. Here, a comparison can be made with the successful effects of the MAC in the Rosenholtz experiment, where the poor readers were also low in social power, but the classroom was all-White. In this experiment, the MAC did not seem sufficiently effective in modifying behavior, all by itself. The problem may be that if few minorities are seen as powerful in the organizational context of the school and in the informal world of the classroom, changing expectations for competence may not be enough. It may not be legitimate for minority children to act influential in the interracial context.

Therefore it would seem necessary to do something about powerlessness as well as something about general expectations for incompetence. The multiple

ability approach combined with a treatmen such as Expectation Training, where the powerless, low status child becomes a competent teacher of the high status child shows some promise. Another practical possibility is the multiple ability approach to group tasks, where the low status child has a chance to perform as group facilitator. This was a method of instruction actually tried out in the post-experimental period at Wordsworth. One child was assigned publicly to the job of making sure that everyone participated and that the group accomplished its task as directed. Low ranking readers were able to function successfully in this role with minimum training. This is a leadership opportunity which should move the powerless into a different social position in the classroom. Yet these children are rarely selected by teachers to play leadership roles. Once expectations for competence have been developed, these children should also show good response to a strong individualized approach to basic skills.

As a final note, the results of this study demonstrate unexpected variability in power and status relations in classrooms. So often today, one reads about how the classroom is a faithful mirror of the economic dominance relations in the outer society (Persell, C., 19). Many of these classrooms did not fit that picture at all. Instead they were in many ways a microcosm of Black Power. Results such as these should prove a healthy corrective for the field; we sociologists are too prone to facile generalizations.

Table 1

Correlation of Reading Rank and Social Power: By Class and Sex

Class	Pearson r		
	Boys	Girls	
1	.54***	.22	
2	.10	.68**	
3	-.42	-.39	
4	-.51*	.35	
5	-.05	-.38	Wordsworth School
6	.43*	.37	
7	-.47	-.14	
8	.28	-.32	
9	.15	-.63**	
10	-.16	-.31	
13	-.02	-.69***	
14	.62*	-.25	
19	-.48*	-.45	
20	-.20	-.03	School II
23	-.56*	-.05	
24	.00	.12	
32	.18	-.13	
33	.02	-.26	School III
34	-.59*	.08	
35	-.14	-.34	

*p <.05
**p <.01
***p <.001

Note: A negative correlation means a positive association between social power and reading rank.

Table 2

Rank Order Correlation of Average Reading Rank with Self-Evaluation on Three New Abilities: By Classroom

Classroom	Intuitive Thinking	Reasoning	Visual Thinking
1	.00	-.186	-.649***
2	.00	.009	.141
3	-.143	.596*	.036
4	-.527*	-.163	.00
5	-.252	.126	-.116
6	-.456*	.047	.432
7	.163	-.03	.305
8	-.08	-.405	-.121
9	-.138	-.126	-.378
10	.195	.412*	.00
11	.275	-.049	.023
12	-.183	.346	-.359

*$p < .05$

***$p < .001$

Note: A negative correlation coefficient indicates that there is a positive association between one's reading rank and one's evaluation on a new ability.

Table 3

Determinants of Percentage of Successful Influence of All S's on Criterion Task: Standardized Regression Coefficients.

Predictors	Beta	F
MAC	.017	.090
MAC + ET	-.005	.007
Black Power Index	-.002	.001
Attributed Power	+.181	11.582**
Low Reader	-.511	93.193**

R^2 = .300

**p<.01

Table 4

Mean Expectancy Advantage for S-T-M Pairs in Three Treatment Conditions: Holding Constant Power of Low Reader Relative to Power of High Reader

Attributed Power of Low Reader - High Reader	Condition	Mean Expectancy Advantage	N of Pairs
-20 or Less	Control	.305	15
	MAC	.211	11
	ET	.067	5
-1 to -19	Control	.102	7
	MAC	.037	2
	MAC + ET	-.050	8
ALL CASES	Control	.203	22
	MAC	.124	13
	MAC + ET	.001	13
0 to +19	Control	.000	9
	MAC	.095	10
	MAC + ET	.218	8
+20 or more	Control	-.008	9
	MAC	-.029	13
	MAC + ET	.051	8
ALL CASES	Control	-.004	18
	MAC	.033	23
	MAC + ET	.134	16

Table 5

Intercorrelations of Power Variables and Expectancy and Influence Advantage Scores: For Those Pairs Where Attributed Power of Low Reader < or = High Reader

	Black Power Index	Power Difference	Expectancy Advantage	Influence Advantage
Black Power Index	1.00	-.049	-.231*	-.046
Power Difference		1.00	-.389**	-.372***
Expectancy Advantage			1.00	+.679***
Influence Advantage				1.00

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

Description of Variables

Expectancy Advantage: % Unique Suggestion of Low Reader minus % Unique Suggestions of High Reader.

Influence Advantage: % Successful Influence of Low Reader minus Successful Influence of High Reader.

Black Power Index: Proportion of choices made by Whites of Blacks in their classroom and sex group as "three most influential students."

Power Difference: Attributed Power of Low Reader minus Attributed Power of High Reader. The Attributed Power Score consists of the number of choices a student receives as most influential minus the number received as least influential. This is divided by the number of student choices and multiplied by 100.

Table 6

Determinants of Expectancy Advantage of High Reader on Criterion Task: For Pairs Where Attributed Power of Low Reader < or = High Reader

N = 48 Pairs

Predictors	Standardized Coefficients	F
Black Power Index	-.236	3.49**
Power Difference	-.368	7.76**
MAC	-.059	0.19
MAC + ET	-.115	0.647

**p < .01

Description of Variables:

Dependent Variable: Expectancy Advantage. % Unique Suggestions of the Low Reader minus % Unique Suggestions of the High Reader.

Independent Variables

Black Power Index: Proportion of choices made by Whites of Blacks in their classroom and sex group as the "three most influential students."

Power Difference: Attributed Power of Low Reader minus Attributed Power of High Reader. The Attributed Power Score consists of the number of choices a student receives as most influential minus the number received as least influential. This is divided by the number of student choices and multiplied by 100.

MAC: Multiple Ability Curriculum

MAC + ET: Multiple Ability Curriculum plus Expectation Training.

Table 7

Frequency and Probability of Low Reader Chosen as Superior on Post Experimental Questionnaire: By Treatment and Relative Attributed Power of Low Reader

A. Who had better ideas?

Relative Attributed Power	Treatment	Low Readers Chosen %	n	N Choices*
Low Reader Less Than or = High Reader	Control	33	(14)	42
	MAC	41	(12)	29
	MAC + ET	43	(9)	21
Low Reader More Than High Reader	Control	42	(11)	26
	MAC	48	(12)	25
	MAC + ET	39	(7)	18

B. Who was leader?

Low Reader Less Than or = High Reader	Control	35	(16)	46
	MAC	41	(13)	32
	MAC + ET	56**	(15)	27
Low Reader More Than High Reader	Control	57	(16)	28
	MAC	38	(9)	24
	MAC + ET	50	(9)	18

*N of Choices = No. of S's who ranked each other rather than choosing "Both."

**Choices of Low Reader for Leadership in this condition just as likely to come from High Reader as Low (8 from High; 7 from low). Also, when the Low Reader of the pair had a very low attributed power score (-10 or less), he/she was just as likely to be chosen as leader as High Reader.

References

Awang-Had Bin Salleh. Effects of Status and Task Outcome Structures Upon Observable Power and Prestige Order of Small Task-Oriented Groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.

Berger, J., Cohen, P.B. & Zelditch, M., Jr. "Status Conceptions and Social Interactions." American Sociological Review, 37, 3:241-255, 1972.

Cohen, E. & Roper, S. "Modification of Interracial Interaction Disability: An Application of Status Characteristic Theory." American Sociological Review, Vol. 37, 6, December, 1972.

Cohen, E. & Sharan, S. "Modifying Status Relations in Israel Youth: An Application of Expectations States Theory." Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, New York, 1977.

Cook, T. Producing Equal Status Interaction Berween Indian and White Boys in British Columbia: An Application of Expectation Training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1974.

Huguenin, K. The Effect of Parity on the School Community Interaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1978.

Hoffman, D. An Exploratory Study to Determine the Effects of Generalized Academic Performance Expectations Upon the Activity and Influence of Students Engaged in a Group Simulation Game. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1972.

Iadicola, P. & Moore, H. The Desegregated School and Status Relations Among Anglo and Minority Students: The Dilemma of School Desegregation. June, 1978.

Persell, C. Education and Inequality. Free Press, New York, 1977.

Riordan, C.Producing Equal-Status Interracial Interaction: A Replication. Unpublished manuscript, 1978.

Robbins, A. Fostering Equal-Status Interaction Through the Establishment of Consistent Staff Behaviors and Appropriate Situational Norms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1977.

Rosenholtz, S.J. The Multiple Abilities Curriculum: An Intervention Against the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1977.

References (continued)

Rosenholtz, S.J. & Wilson, B. The Effect of Classroom Structure on Shared Perceptions of Ability. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1978.

Stulac, J. The Self Fulfilling-Prophecy: Modifying the Effects of a Unidimensional Perception of Academic Competence in Task-Oriented Groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Webster, M. & Driskell, J. Status Generalization: A Review and Some New Data. American Sociological Review, 43, 1978, 220-236.